

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.

I AM WRITING TO OBJECT TO SINCLAIR BROADCASTING'S BLATANT ATTEMPT TO SKEW THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION BY FORCING ITS SIXTY-SOME STATIONS AIR WHAT AMOUNTS TO A 90-MINTUE INFOMERCIAL AGAINST JOHN KERRY DAYS BEFORE THE ELCETION.

THIS IS AN EXAMPLE OF WHY MEDIA CONSOLIDATION IS DANGEROUS: ONE CORPORATION SKIRTS THE EQUAL TIME RULE BY CALLING THEIR PROPAGANDA "NEWS" AND THE EFFECT IF HUGE BECAUSE OF HOW MANY MARKETS THEY COVER.

TWO THINGS NEED TO HAPPEN HERE:

- 1) THE FCC MUST ENFORCE THE RULE IT HAS ABOUT EQUAL TIME, AND NOT BE FOOLED BY CALLING PROPAGANDA "NEWS" AND,
- 2) OWNERSHIP RULES NEED TO BE REVISED TO PREVENT ONE PRIVATE CORPORATION FROM OWNING--AND THEREFORE BEING ABLE TO ABUSE--THE PUBLIC'S AIRWAVES.

THE PUBLIC OWNS THE AIRWAVES.